

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO**

---

SECURITY USA SERVICES, LLC,

Plaintiff / Counter-defendant,

v.

No. 1:20-cv-01100 KWR/KRS

INVARIANT CORP., and  
HYPERION TECHNOLOGY GROUP, INC.,

Defendants / Counterclaimants.


**ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF TO RESPOND**

**THIS MATTER** comes before the Court upon supplemental briefing ordered by the Court. *See Doc. 147.* The Court directed the parties to file supplemental briefing responding to certain issues identified by the Court, including the scope of the injunction. *See Doc. 147 at 13-14.* Plaintiff and Defendants filed supplemental briefs. **Docs. 150, 151.** Plaintiff's brief was largely off-topic. Plaintiff did not address the scope of the injunction, aside from addressing geographic scope. Rather, Plaintiff merely addressed issues the Court has repeatedly rejected. The Court directs Plaintiff to respond to Defendant's supplemental briefing (**Doc. 151**) within **seven (7) days** of the entry of this order.<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff should also address Defendants' contention that EAGL Technology should be included in the injunction. If Plaintiff does not file a response or does not address the scope of the injunction or Defendants' supplemental brief, the Court will assume that Plaintiff does not object to the scope of Defendants' proposed injunction.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Court has shortened the usual response deadline, given that Plaintiff has already had the opportunity to brief these issues but squandered its opportunity.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**



---

**KEA W. RIGGS**  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**